

the perpetuity of baptism, no individual can become a disciple of Christ without it, is so clearly made out that I venture to assert that you will not dare to dispute the authority adduced. The only point now necessary to be established, to make the whole clear to the most common capacity, is,—can a child of Adam become a disciple of Christ without being born again? I have been acquainted with many Methodist clergymen, with whom it was always a favourite theme, that to be born again was essential to constitute a disciple of Christ. I shall then venture to conclude that you believe the same doctrine. Hear, then, my conclusion from these premises. Christ and his apostles taught the necessity of baptism in order to being born again; Christ proclaimed to Nicodemus the necessity of being born of water and spirit in order to the new birth; therefore, to be born of water and the spirit is equivalent to believing and being baptized. Now, Sir, if you can detect an error either in the premises or the conclusion of this argument, I hope you will do your best to expose it.

10. But you admit the premises in the above argument; for you say that “Mr. Wesley’s note on Acts xxii. 16, is generally believed by Wesleyan Ministers.” Then Wesleyan Ministers believe that “baptism to real penitents is both the means and seal of pardon!” Why, then, do they *rantize* babes that have no sins to pardon, and maintain almost perpetual silence on the subject of baptism when addressing penitents on the great doctrines of pardon and justification! The fact is, Sir, in your opposition to the doctrine of baptism for remission of sins, advocated by myself, and a few others scattered over New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, not only do you oppose us, but Mr. Wesley and the Apostles of Jesus Christ! This may be construed into a grave charge, but it is none the less true for that. None question the literal construction of John iii. 5, but those who are opposed to the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, a doctrine taught by the apostles and the primitive church, and never questioned until within a very few centuries.

11. I am pleased to hear your admission in relation to human authority, and with you I will readily say I am not so much concerned to know what others may think of being born of water and spirit, as the meaning attached to it by the Lord. Yet, notwithstanding this, Dr. Clarke and Bishop Hopkins are the only witnesses cited to prove that the text is figurative. I have the Doctor’s remarks beside me, which, taken altogether, show that he was not fully satisfied relative to his own exposition; but you need some aid, and I will, therefore, let you have the Bishop and the Doctor, together with Dr. Scott and the Baptist Dr. Gill; but have any of them gone into a critical examination of this text? If they have, the world has not been blessed with the result of their researches! Have any of those men cited a passage where one word in the sentence has had a figurative and the other a literal meaning? Have they given the *rationale* of associating literal and figurative language in the same sentence to explain a subject of such vast importance?

12. But if human authority has any weight with you, Sir, take the following:—

That John iii. 5, and Titus iii. 5, refer to immersion, is the judgment of all the learned Catholics and Protestants of every name under Heaven.

The authors and finishers of the Westminster creed—one hundred and twenty